

NOV 21 2006

Appln. No. 10/622,939
Amendment dated November 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 12 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

Claims 5 through 7 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 5 has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language. Specifically, in claim 5, the word "complimentary" has been changed to -complementary--.

Claims 10 and 12 have been objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claims 9 and 11. Claims 10 and 12 have been amended in the manner suggested in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 5 through 7, 10 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/622,939
Amendment dated November 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Prince.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Drulias.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "said coupling assembly including a first strap member extending from a first side of said main housing assembly and a second strap member extending from a second side of said main housing assembly", "a first bore extending through said first strap member for receiving a hand of a user", and "a second bore extending through said second strap member for receiving a second hand of the user".

It is submitted that the cited patents, and especially the Prince and Drulias patents relied upon in the rejections of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 2 through 6, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections of claims 1 through 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that claim 7 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claims 1 and 5 (in their as-filed form) into the recitation of claim 7, and therefore claim 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

NOV 21 2006

Appln. No. 10/622,939
Amendment dated November 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Nov. 21, 2006

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357